



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/519,102

12/27/2004

Imao Mikoshiba

Q85257

9490

23373 7590 07/13/2007  
SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER

FINN, MEGHAN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1609

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

07/13/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/519,102	Applicant(s) MIKOSHIBA ET AL.	
	Examiner Meghan Finn	Art Unit 1609	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20,22- 23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20, 22-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)            | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>February 08, 2005</u> .                                       | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

The information disclosure statement filed December 27, 2004 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. The NPL reference from the Japanese Journal of Clinical Medicine was provided without a translation or an English language equivalent. As such its relevance cannot be determined and it has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

### ***Claim Objections***

Claim 14 is objected to due to minor informalities. Claim 14 is a method claim, which as written is dependent on claim 1, a composition. It appears to the examiner that claim 14 was intended to be dependent on claim 12, but this mistake needs to be corrected so that it correctly depends from a proper claim.

### ***Double Patenting***

Claims 1-6, 12-14, and 19-20 of this application conflict with claims 1-6, and 11-15 of Application No. 10/519155. 37 CFR 1.78(b) provides that when two or more

Art Unit: 1609

applications filed by the same applicant contain conflicting claims, elimination of such claims from all but one application may be required in the absence of good and sufficient reason for their retention during pendency in more than one application.

Applicant is required to either cancel the conflicting claims from all but one application or maintain a clear line of demarcation between the applications. See MPEP § 822.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

Art Unit: 1609

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-6 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-6 of Application No. 10/519155. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it is commonly known in the art that the best way of preventing diabetic complications is through glycemic control. Additionally, the two pharmaceutical compositions are identical, and despite their different intended uses, they are unpatentable over each other.

Claims 12-14, and 19-20 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 11-15 of copending Application No. 10/519155. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because while claims 12-14, 19-20, and 11-15 are method claims and the intended use is an essential component of each claim, glycemic control and prevention of diabetic complications are so closely linked to everyone who treats or researches diabetes that they are essentially the same thing. Since the composition to be used and the dosages are identical the intended use is the

Art Unit: 1609

only point that differs in the claims and treating one condition would inherently treat the other condition, and thus the two methods are not patentably distinct.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 9-11 provide for the use of mitiglinide to treat diabetes, but, since the claim does not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a use without any active, positive steps delimiting how this use is actually practiced.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Art Unit: 1609

Claims 9-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a use, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101. See for example *Ex parte Dunki*, 153 USPQ 678 (Bd.App. 1967) and *Clinical Products, Ltd. v. Brenner*, 255 F. Supp. 131, 149 USPQ 475 (D.D.C. 1966).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 12-13, and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ohnota et al. (Novel Rapid- and Short-Acting Hypoglycemic Agent, a Calcium(2s)-2-benzyl-3-(cis-hexahydro-2-isoindolinylicarbonyl)Propionate(KAD-1229) That Acts on the Sulfonylurea Receptor: Comparison of Effects Between KAD-1229 and Gliclazide).

Claims 1-5, 7-8 are a composition comprising mitiglinide and Ohnota et al. teaches a composition KAD-1229 which has the same structure as the mitiglinide calcium salt hydrate described as the applicant's preferred embodiment in the specification. KAD-1229 was a name used in early literature but it is referring to the

Art Unit: 1609

same structure, figure 1 of Ohnota et al. is the exact same structure as that in the applicant's specification (page 5, line 1). Since claims 1-5, and 7-8 are composition claims wherein the composition comprises mitiglinide, Ohnota et al. has anticipated the applicant's claims for a composition comprising mitiglinide or a mitiglinide calcium salt hydrate.

Claims 12-13, and 15-17 are anticipated by Ohnota et al. as well. In addition to teaching a composition comprising mitiglinide as discussed supra, Ohnota et al. teaches use of the composition for treating diabetes and achieving better glycemic control than previously possible with previous alternative drugs (page 494, column 2, paragraph 2), and also teaches that the composition will be an effective agent for treating postprandial hyperglycemia (page 494, column 1, paragraph 1). Claims 12-13, and 15-17 outline dosages to be used from 5-45mg, and Ohnota et al. also teaches dosages from 0.3 to 3.0 mg/kg (page 491, column 1, paragraph 1). If one uses an average individual weight of 120 lbs or 55kg, then the dosages outlined in Ohnota et al. would be equivalent to 16-165mg. This falls within the dosage range outlined in claims 12, 15-16 (5-45mg) and claims 13 and 17 (5-22mg) thus Ohnota et al. anticipates these claims.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ouchi et al. (WO 00/71117). EP 1179342 A1, also by Ouchi et al. is a 371 national stage entry of WO 00/71117 and is being used as the English equivalent of WO 00/71117 since the WO application is in Japanese. All references to page numbers will refer to EP 1179342A1.



Claim 6 is also a composition comprising mitiglinide, with the added limitation that the dissolution time is 20 minutes or less. Ouchi et al. teaches not only the composition (paragraph [0005], line 50) but also that said compound has a dissolution time well under 20 minutes according to the same test, the first fluid of Japanese Pharmacopoeia (Paragraph [0010], line 30). Thus claim 6 is anticipated by Ouchi et al.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Ohnota et al in view of Ouchi et al. (WO 00/71117 or EP 1179342A1).

In Claims 14 and 18, the applicant specifies dosages of 10-11mg if mitiglinide calcium salt hydrate. As discussed above, Ohnota et al. anticipates the applicant's invention for dosages between 16-165mg. Ohnota et al. does fail to specifically teach the usefulness of mitiglinide with a dosage of 10-11mg, but, as it is well known in the art, it is always desirable to use smaller mg/kg dosages to mitigate side effects, so it would be obvious to use a lower range and 10mg would be an obvious dosage variant from the 16mg described in Ohnota et al. Additionally, Ouchi et al. teaches a composition for mitiglinide calcium salt hydrate from 5mg to 22mg for use in treatment of diabetes. So it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the method of Ohnota et al. by administering a lower dosage such as that taught by Ouchi et al. in order to have mitigated potential side effects. Thus use of 10-11mg such as described in claims 14 and 18 would be obvious over Ohnota et al.

Claims 19-20 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Landgraf et al. (A comparison of repaglinide and glibenclamide in the treatment of type 2 diabetic patients previously treated with sulphonylureas) in view of Ohnota et al. and Evans et al. (Recent Developments and Emerging Therapies for Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus).

In claims 19-20 and 22-23 the method is the same as that in claim 12 or 16 respectively except the method additionally involves treating patients with mitiglinide 3 times a day for 4 weeks or more. Ohnota teaches all the limitations of claims 12 and 16 and Landgraf et al. teaches the use of repaglinide 3 times per day for 4 weeks or more (page 166, column 1) as an effective way to treat diabetes, control postprandial hyperglycemia, control glucose levels and help reduce risk of diabetic complications (page 165, column 2). Repaglinide is not chemically equivalent to mitiglinide, however Evans et al. (Drugs in R&D, 1999) teaches that they are both members of the meglitinide family of anti-diabetic drugs (page 78, section 3.2) and have that both repaglinide and mitiglinide have similar anti-postprandial hyperglycemic effects (page 87, section 4.1.2). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention that therapies involving mitiglinide would be similar to repaglinide and one of the best things to try when developing a new therapy is what worked for a similar acting drug. Thus it would be obvious to take the teachings of Ohnota et al. and Landgraf et al. in view of Evans et al. and expect similar results for mitiglinide when using the 3 times a day for 4 weeks therapy such as described in claims 19-20 and 22-23.

### ***Conclusion***

No claims are allowed.

The prior art references of (Ohnota, Ouchi, Landgraf, Evans, Yamaguchi, Wuthrich, Lecouve, Kitahara, and Makino) are cited as being relevant to the application

Art Unit: 1609

and are provided to show the extent of knowledge in the art about mitiglinide as an anti-diabetic drug prior to the applicant's invention.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meghan Finn whose telephone number is (571) 270-3281. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5pm Mon-Thu, 7:30am-4pm Friday (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Stucker can be reached on 571-272-0911. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Meghan Finn

*Ardin H. Marschel* 6/23/07  
ARDIN H. MARSCHEL  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER